UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

COPY MAILED

JUL 3 0 2008

In re Application of

Shota Murakami, et. al.

Application No. 10/574,977

Filed: April 7, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 23697-015US1/NF-2981

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

DECISION ON PETITION

UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed July 7, 2008, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional application set forth in the amendment filed with the petition.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Sushil Shrinivasan appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he/she is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he/she acts.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the priorfiled application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in $\S 1.17(t)$; and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition does not satisfy item (1) above.

The reference to add the above-noted, prior-filed application in the first sentence of the specification on page one following the title is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed application. An incorporation by reference statement added after an application's filing date is not effective because no new matter can be added to an application after its filing date (see 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)). If an incorporation by reference statement is included in an amendment to the specification to add a benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 after the filing date of the application, the amendment would not be proper. When a benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 is submitted after the filing of an application, the reference to the prior application cannot include an incorporation by reference statement of the prior application. See Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980). Note MPEP §§ 201.06(c) and 608.04(b).

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a renewed petition under 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3) and an Application Data Sheet or a substitute amendment (complying with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121 and 37 CFR 1.76(b)(5)) to correct the above matters are required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop PETITIONS

Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:

Customer Service Window

Mail Stop Petitions Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:

(571) 273-8300

ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3226.

Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions